

Date: Mon, 23 May 94 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #219
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 23 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 219

Today's Topics:

 Code test speeds (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 22 May 1994 18:58:06 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!indirect.com!
nu7i@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello. I passed my extra class license when I was 12 years old. I
worked very hard on that, thank you! No, I didn't know Calculus then but
I did have a basic understand of the concepts involved.
Let's leave the licenses alone and go after some of the important things
like saving our frequency spectrum! 73

--
Darrell Shandrow at Arizona State University
Mentor: Internet Direct Mentorship Program!
Member: National Federation of the Blind
(The complete information access agenda - You print it you braille it too!)

Date: 22 May 1994 19:06:07 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!indirect.com!

nu7i@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I think I am seeing some signs of intolerance in the ham community. It is important to remember that there are all kinds of hams as there are all kinds of members in the general, nonamateur radio, public. This is indeed a good thing.

Personally, I am glad that ham radio is no longer a bunch of techies. Please note that we still in no way have a shortage of techies and they do great things for the hobby. They make it possible for many of the rest of us to communicate. However, it is not right to expect everyone who wishes to be a ham op to have electrical engineering degrees, etc.

I see two sides of the issue, some of which overlap in some ways for sure.

One camp wants to keep the code requirement. The other camp would like to see the code reduced but would like to increase, exponentially, the technical requirements on the written tests.

Yes, it is a good idea to have basic electrical and radio theory questions on a test. For example, every ham should understand that the resonant frequency of an antenna depends on its length among other smaller factors.

However, it doesn't seem right that someone on the test should have to know how to build a transmitter from the ground up or work with integrated circuits.

On the other side, the continue code camp also would like to see ham radio stay an exclusive hobby. Imho, neither of these camps work these days. I am hearing lots of new voices on the air and think it's great. Yes, there is some abuse here and there but this kind of thing exists in every aspect of life and it must be dealt with. After that, we must move on and not cry about it.

Just my \$.02. I'm sure it will get something going here. 73

--

Darrell Shandrow at Arizona State University
Mentor: Internet Direct Mentorship Program!
Member: National Federation of the Blind
(The complete information access agenda - You print it you braille it too!)

Date: 22 May 1994 01:58:24 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!indirect.com!
nu7i@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <cf.695.488.0N2EEB64@ledge.com>, <2rm331\$i1j@ccnet.ccnet.com>,
<2rmci7\$nil@sefl.satelnet.org>

Subject : Re: FCC understaffing problem

Hmmm, well, there are many who are licensed hams and have no equipment of their own. They get licensed to use club stations and internet to packet gateways. So it is not right to say that all hams are spending hundreds of dollars on radio gear. Many can't afford that.

Besides, the way our government works, we will then have to pay for the license and there will be absolutely no improvement. 73

--

Darrell Shandrow at Arizona State University

Mentor: Internet Direct Mentorship Program!

Member: National Federation of the Blind

(The complete information access agenda - You print it you braille it too!)

Date: Mon, 23 May 1994 02:25:20 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem109.ucdavis.edu!

ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <hamilton.768924220@BIX.com>, <051694162854Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<2rig76\$5es@hebron.connected.com>

Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <2rig76\$5es@hebron.connected.com> dragonsl@hebron.connected.com (Ralph Lindberg) writes:

>From: dragonsl@hebron.connected.com (Ralph Lindberg)

>Subject: Re: Code test speeds

>Date: 20 May 1994 07:07:34 -0700

> If someone else has posted this, sorry my servies news server was down
>and we missed somethings.

> The code requirement for HF transmission cannot be removed, it's in the
>international treatys that control Ham radio. Some counties water it down
>so much that it's hardly there, BUT IT'S STILL THERE.

No, it's not always "still there" Japan is one example. The treaty says that the only requirement regarding code is to require competency in the code OR submit a letter to the effect that you are not going to require code.

Dan

=====

Dan Todd

ddtodd@ucdavis.edu

kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na

Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy
=====

Date: Mon, 23 May 1994 00:20:57 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May12.123437.27847@cs.brown.edu>, <Cpp8x4.8Hs@icon.rose.hp.com>,
<051294232103Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <051294232103Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

>
>There is no reason not to be proud. (All puns and jokes aside. However,
>just because you can emulate a modem does not mean that everyone can.)

More than 95% can. Practice, practice practice!

Vietnamese Proverb: If you study you will become what you wish
 If you do not study you will never become anything.

.73,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: Mon, 23 May 1994 00:18:01 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9405111559.AA00194@hwking.cca.rockwell.com>,
<hamilton.768755278@BIX.com>, <051294231326Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <051294231326Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

>
>"I" did/can to it so that PROVES other people with different problems and
>abilities can. (How is that again?)

Phooey. I go away for 2 months and return and still see the same weak arguments
against the code. Thus, I will give the same strong arguments for code:

Coast Guard Radioman School took in folks who had no background in code or radio. After 5 months 95% of these people graduated as USCG Radiomen with a code speed of 22 wpm. The 5% failure rate was due to:

- * discipline problems (military life isn't for everyone)
- * repeatedly failing a particular block exam (radio fundamentals, code, etc)

So MORE THAN 95% were able to learn code.

Prospective hams who can't learn the code should either put more effort into it, get the no-code license, or choose another aspect of the radio hobby (11M or 1750M, or shortwave listening), or just choose another hobby.

It seems that up until the invention of the radio newsgroups on USENET no one complained about learning the code to get a license. I can't recall reading ANY letters to the editor in QST in the 60's or 70's about anyone whinning about the code.

What is it about USENET that makes people so mentally and physically lazy?

>You can, I can, does NOT mean EVERYONE can.

More than 95% can.

I wanted to be a commercial pilot but I couldn't pass the eye exam; I took up sailing instead. Should I petition the FAA to delete the eye exam? Certainly not. Just accept your weaknesses and do something else.

>Gully, I can pretend to be half as good as a computer modem, I am special.

Computers can translate so why do we still see people learning foreign languages? You probably see that as a waste of time.

.73,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: 23 May 1994 10:42:24 +0300
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!pipex!sunic!news.funet.fi!news.cc.tut.fi!
proffa.cc.tut.fi!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May19.102423.2447@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <270@ted.win.net>,
<1994May22.215305.3550@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

> I suggest that, like the Bar exam,
> there only need be *one* class of amateur license. That exam needs
> to stress things *all* amateurs need to know in order to conduct
> their amateur experimentation safely and without causing undue
> interference to other services. None of the current license classes
> really directly address these issues. They're more concerned with
> steering a particular career ladder.

The only problem with a single license class is that you have to set these requirements quite high. If we want youngsters (say 6th or 9th graders) into this hobby, it might be too hard to teach all the basics needed to understand these requirements (and not just memorize the questions).

In addition to the full license, there should be an easier entrance class with very limited privileges (low power (5-30 W), limited bands, type accepted transmitters or at least checked by a full license ham). By keeping the power levels low, low voltage (or even battery powered) solid state equipment would be used and there would not be many electric safety issues to worry about. The risk for EMC problems would also be small. The Novice license in the U.K. was created using similar guidelines.

The U.S. Tech license is a strange creature, requirements suitable for an entrance license but full privileges above 30 MHz. You are allowed to build 1.5 kW transmitters using a few kV of plate voltage or spew out a few megawatts of e.r.p. in the microwave bands. The Tech question pool (at least the previous one that I have seen) is clearly inadequate for these privileges.

In Europe there is a strong desire to harmonize the license requirements for a full privilege license (CEPT recommendation T/R 61-02 HAREC). This has been going on for a few years. Now they are trying to harmonize the entrance class requirements, but unfortunately the opinions about the requirements and privileges are very different in different countries and I haven't heard what the outcome was from the last conference this month.

There are currently two variants of the full HAREC license, HAREC B is for full privileges above 30 MHz and HAREC A requires in addition a 12 WPM test for full privileges on all bands.

My guess is that the ITU will remove the CW requirement within the next decade and that the initiative comes from inside the ITU and not from the conservative IARU (International Amateur Radio Union).

Within a decade after that, even the most conservative nations will drop the CW requirement. Then we will have a single full license (and hopefully a common entrance license) in Europe. I hope that by that time the U.S. license structure would be simplified, so that we could get rid of the reciprocal licenses when traveling across the Pond.

Paul OH3LWR

Phone : +358-31-213 3657
X.400 : G=Paul S=Keinanen O=Kotiposti A=ELISA C=FI
Internet: Paul.Keinanen@Telebox.Mailnet.fi
Telex : 58-100 1825 (ATTN: Keinanen Paul)
Mail : Hameenpuisto 42 A 26
FIN-33200 TAMPERE
FINLAND

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #219
